David Krieger, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 9086 HAINES & KRIEGER, LLC 5041 N. Rainbow Blvd. Las Vegas, Nevada 89130 Phone: (702) 880-5554

Phone: (702) 880-5554 FAX: (702) 967-6665

Email: <u>dkrieger@hainesandkrieger.com</u> Attorney for Plaintiff, Nancy Sagona

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Nancy Sagona, Plaintiff,	: Civil Action No.:
v. Enhanced Recovery Company, LLC,	: : : COMPLAINT
Defendant.	:

Plaintiff, Nancy Sagona, by and through her undersigned counsel, pleading on her own behalf and on behalf of all others similarly situated, states as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. Plaintiff, Nancy Sagona ("Plaintiff"), brings this class action for damages resulting from the illegal actions of Enhanced Recovery Company, LLC ("Enhanced" or "Defendant"). Defendant negligently, knowingly, and/or willfully placed automated calls to Plaintiff's cellular phone in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, et seq. (the "TCPA").

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2. This Court has original jurisdiction over Plaintiff's TCPA claims. *Mims v. Arrow Fin. Serv., LLC*, 132 S.Ct. 740 (2012).

- 3. Jurisdiction in this District is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2), as Plaintiff seeks up to \$1,500.00 in damages for each violation of the TCPA, which when aggregated among a proposed class numbering more than a thousand members, exceeds the \$5,000,000.00 threshold for federal court jurisdiction. Plaintiff also alleges a national class which will result in at least one class member residing in a different state.
- 4. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b) & (c), because Plaintiff resides within the District of Nevada, a substantial portion of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred in this District, and Defendant regularly conducts business in this District.

PARTIES

- 5. Plaintiff is, and at all times mentioned herein was, an adult individual residing in Henderson, Nevada.
- 6. Enhanced is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a Florida business entity headquartered in Jacksonville, Florida.

THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT OF 1991

- 7. In 1991, Congress enacted the TCPA in response to a growing number of consumer complaints regarding certain telemarketing practices.
- 8. The TCPA regulates, among other things, the use of automated telephone dialing systems.
- 9. 47 U.S.C. § 227(a)(1) defines an automatic telephone dialing system ("ATDS") as equipment having the capacity
 - (A) to store or produce telephone numbers to be called, using a random or sequential number generator; and
 - (B) to dial such numbers.

- 10. Specifically, 47 U.S.C. § 227(1)(A)(iii) prohibits any call using an ATDS or an artificial or prerecorded voice to a cellular phone without prior express consent by the person being called, unless the call is for emergency purposes.
- 11. According to findings by the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC"), such calls are prohibited because automated or prerecorded telephone calls are a greater nuisance and invasion of privacy than live solicitation calls. The FCC also recognized that wireless customers are charged for incoming calls.¹
- 12. On January 4, 2008, the FCC released a Declaratory Ruling wherein it confirmed that autodialed and prerecorded calls to a wireless number by a creditor, or on behalf of a creditor, are permitted only if the calls are made with the "prior express consent" of the called party.²

ALLEGATIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL COUNTS

- 13. Upon information and belief, Defendant employed an ATDS which meets the definition set forth in 47 U.S.C. § 227(a)(1).
- 14. Beginning in or around January 2012, Defendant has repeatedly contacted Plaintiff on Plaintiff's cellular telephone using an "artificial or prerecorded voice" as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A).
- 15. The telephone number that Defendant used to contact Plaintiff was and is assigned to a cellular telephone service as specified in 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)(iii).
- 16. Pursuant to the contract with her cellular service provider, Plaintiff is charged for incoming calls made to her cellular telephone.

¹ Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991, CG Docket No. 02-278, Report and Order, 18 FCC Rcd 14014 (2003).

² In the Matter of Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991, 23 F.C.C.R. 559, 23 FCC Rcd 559, 43 Communications Reg. (P&F) 877, 2008 WL 65485 (F.C.C.) (2008).

- 17. Defendant did not have prior express consent to place automated or prerecorded calls to Plaintiff on her cellular telephone.
- 18. Defendant's calls to Plaintiff's cellular telephone were not for "emergency purposes."
- 19. Pursuant to the TCPA and the FCC's January 2008 Declaratory Ruling, the burden is on Defendant to demonstrate that it had prior express consent to call Plaintiff's cellular phone with an ATDS using a prerecorded voice.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

A. The Class

- 20. Plaintiff brings this case as a class action pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23 on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated.
 - 21. Plaintiff's proposed Class is as follows, subject to amendment as appropriate:

<u>Class Definition.</u> All persons within the United States who received one or more non-emergency telephone calls from Enhanced to a cellular telephone through the use of an ATDS or an artificial or prerecorded voice and who did not provide prior express consent for such calls.

22. Excluded from the Class are all officers, directors, and employees of Defendant, together with those individuals' immediate family members, and their respective legal representatives, heirs, successors and assigns, the officers, directors and employees of any parent, subsidiary or affiliate of Defendant, together with those individuals' immediate family members, Counsel for Defendant and Class Counsel and their immediate family members, in addition to those whose claims are barred by the statute of limitations.

B. Numerosity

23. Upon information and belief, Defendant has placed automated calls using an artificial or prerecorded voice to cellular telephone numbers belonging to thousands of

consumers throughout the United States without their prior express consent. The members of the Class, therefore, are believed to be so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable.

24. The exact number and identities of the Class members are unknown at this time and can only be ascertained through discovery. Identification of the Class members is a matter capable of ministerial determination from Defendant's call records.

C. Common Questions of Law and Fact

- 25. There are common questions of law and fact raised in this Complaint which predominate over any questions affecting only individual Class members.
- 26. The following questions of law and fact common to the Class members are ripe for determination:
 - a. Whether Defendant made non-emergency calls to Plaintiff and Class members' cellular telephones using an ATDS or an artificial or prerecorded voice;
 - b. Whether Defendant can meet its burden of showing it obtained prior express consent to make each call;
 - c. Whether Defendant's conduct was knowing willful, and/or negligent;
 - d. Whether Defendant is liable for damages, and the amount of such damages; and
 - e. Whether Defendant should be enjoined from such conduct in the future.
- 27. The common questions in this case are capable of having common answers. If Plaintiff's claim that Defendant routinely places automated calls using an artificial or prerecorded voice to telephone numbers assigned to cellular telephone services, Plaintiff and the Class members will have identical claims capable of being efficiently adjudicated and

administered in this case.

D. Typicality

28. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the Class since each of the claims arises from the same or a substantially similar automated telephone call.

E. Protecting the Interests of the Class Members

- 29. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent Class interests.
- 30. All Class claims arise from the very course of conduct and specific activities complained of herein and require application of the same legal principles.
- 31. Plaintiff has retained counsel experienced in litigating consumer claims and who stands ready, willing, and able to represent the Class.

F. Proceeding Via Class Action is Superior and Advisable

- 32. A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy.
- 33. Absent a class action, most members of the Class would find the cost of litigating their claims to be prohibitive, and therefore would have no effective remedy at law.
- 34. The members of the Class are generally unsophisticated individuals whose rights will not be vindicated absent a class action.
- 35. The class treatment of common questions of law and fact is also superior to multiple individual actions or piecemeal litigation in that it conserves the resources of both the Court and the litigants, and promotes consistency and efficiency of adjudication.
- 36. Prosecution of separate actions could result in inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual Class members that would establish incompatible standards of conduct for Defendant. Conversely, adjudications with respect to individual Class

members would be dispositive of the interest of all other Class members.

37. The amount of money at issue is such that proceeding by way of a class action is the only economical and sensible manner to vindicate the injuries sustained by Plaintiff and the other members of the Class.

Negligent Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, et seq.

- 38. Plaintiff repeats and realleges the above paragraphs of this Complaint and incorporates them herein by reference.
- 39. Defendant negligently placed multiple automated calls using an artificial or prerecorded voice to cellular numbers belonging to Plaintiff and the other members of the Class without their prior express consent.
- 40. Each of the aforementioned calls by Defendant constitutes a negligent violation of the TCPA.
- 41. As a result of Defendant's negligent violations of the TCPA, Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to an award of \$500.00 in statutory damages for each call in violation of the TCPA pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B).
- 42. Additionally, Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to and seek injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct by Defendant in the future.

COUNT II Knowing and/or Willful Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, et seq.

- 43. Plaintiff repeats and realleges the above paragraphs of this Complaint and incorporates them herein by reference.
- 44. Defendant knowingly and/or willfully placed multiple automated calls using an artificial or prerecorded voice to cellular numbers belonging to Plaintiff and the other members

of the Class without their prior express consent.

- 45. Each of the aforementioned calls by Defendant constitutes a knowing and/or willful violation of the TCPA.
- 46. As a result of Defendant's knowing and/or willful violations of the TCPA, Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to an award of treble damages up to \$1,500.00 for each call in violation of the TCPA pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B) and 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C).
- 47. Additionally, Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to and seek injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct by Defendant in the future.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that the Court grant Plaintiff and the Class the following relief against Defendant:

- 1. Injunctive relief prohibiting such violations of the TCPA by Defendant in the future;
- 2. Statutory damages of \$500.00 for each and every call in violation of the TCPA pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B);
- 3. Treble damages of up to \$1,500.00 for each and every call in violation of the TCPA pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C);
- 4. An award of attorney's fees and costs to counsel for Plaintiff and the Class; and
- 5. Such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED ON ALL COUNTS

Respectfully

Dated: October 25, 2012

David Krieger, Esq. Haines & Krieger

5041 N. Rainbow Blvd.

Las Vegas, NV 89130

Phone: 702-880-5554 Fax: 702-385-5518

DavidKrieger@hainesandkrieger.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

SS 44 (Rev. 12/07)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

		<u> </u>			
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDANTS		
Nancy Sagona			Enhanced Recovery Company, LLC		
(b) County of Residence (EX	of First Listed Plaintiff County of C	clark		First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES OF CONDEMNATION CASES, US	
			Attorneys (If Known)		
* *	, Address, and Telephone Number)		Attorneys (II Known)		
David Krieger, Esq., 504	11 N. Rainbow Blvd., Las Vegas	s, NV 89130,			
Phone: 702-880-5554 x		# # GI	TIZENCIUD OF D	DINCIDAL DADTIES	Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff
II. BASIS OF JURISD	OICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)		TIZENSHIP OF PI (For Diversity Cases Only)	RINCIPAL PARTIES	and One Box for Defendant)
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	■ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)	Citize	en of This State		
2 U.S. Government Defendant	 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Ite 		en of Another State	2	
	(madeae chizznam) or ranco in m	Citize	en or Subject of a reign Country	3	0 6 0 6
IV. NATURE OF SUI	T (Place an "X" in One Box Only)				
CONTRACT	TORTS		REETTURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act	☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 362 Persor ☐ 315 Airplane Product ☐ Med. 1	nal Injury -	O Agriculture O Other Food & Drug Drug Related Seizure	☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 ☐ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157	☐ 400 State Reapportionment ☐ 410 Antitrust ☐ 430 Banks and Banking ☐ 450 Commerce
 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment 	Liability 365 Person		of Property 21 USC 881 0 Liquor Laws	PROPERTY RIGHTS	460 Deportation
& Enforcement of Judgment	Slander 🗖 368 Asbest	tos Personal 🗖 64	0 R.R. & Truck	■ 820 Copyrights	☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations
☐ 151 Medicare Act	330 Federal Employers' Injury Liability Liability	L	60 Airline Regs. 60 Occupational	830 Patent 840 Trademark	480 Consumer Credit
☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans	340 Marine PERSONAL	PROPERTY	Safety/Health		490 Cable/Sat TV
(Excl. Veterans)	☐ 345 Marine Product ☐ 370 Other ☐		00 Other	SOCIAL SECURITY	810 Selective Service 850 Securities/Commodities/
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits	Liability 371 Truth i		0 Fair Labor Standards	□ 861 HIA (1395ff)	Exchange
☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits	☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Proper	rty Damage	Act	862 Black Lung (923)	☐ 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410
☐ 190 Other Contract☐ 195 Contract Product Liability	Product Liability 385 Proper		20 Labor/Mgmt. Relations 30 Labor/Mgmt.Reporting	☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) ☐ 864 SSID Title XVI	☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions
☐ 196 Franchise	Injury	ot Elability 2 /-	& Disclosure Act	☐ 865 RSI (405(g))	☐ 891 Agricultural Acts
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS PRISONER		40 Railway Labor Act 90 Other Labor Litigation	FEDERAL TAX SUITS ☐ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff	892 Economic Stabilization Act 893 Environmental Matters
☐ 210 Land Condemnation ☐ 220 Foreclosure	☐ 441 Voting ☐ 510 Motion ☐ 442 Employment Senten		91 Empl. Ret. Inc.	or Defendant)	☐ 894 Energy Allocation Act
230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	1 443 Housing/ Habeas Co	1	Security Act	☐ 871 IRS—Third Party	3 895 Freedom of Information
240 Torts to Land	Accommodations 530 General 444 Welfare 535 Death		IMMIGRATION	26 USC 7609	Act 900Appeal of Fee Determination
☐ 245 Tort Product Liability ☐ 290 All Other Real Property			62 Naturalization Application	1	Under Equal Access
	Employment 550 Civil I		63 Habeas Corpus -		to Justice 950 Constitutionality of
	☐ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - ☐ 555 Prison Other ☐ 440 Other Civil Rights		Alien Detainee 65 Other Immigration Actions		State Statutes
☑ 1 Original ☐ 2 F	e an "X" in One Box Only) Removed from	urt Rec	ppened anoth	sferred from a 6 Multidis er district ify) 6 Litigatio	n Judgment
W. CAUGE OF ACT	Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under where 47 U.S.C. Section 227 et	hich you are filing t seq.	(Do not cite jurisdiction	al statutes unless diversity):	
VI. CAUSE OF ACT	Brief description of cause: Violations of the Telepho	ne Consumer	Protection Act (10	CPA) and Class Action	n Request
VII. REQUESTED II COMPLAINT:	N Z CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS UNDER F.R.C.P. 23	SACTION I	DEMAND S	CHECK YES onl JURY DEMANI	y if demanded in complaint: Yes No
VIII. RELATED CA	SE(S) (See instructions): JUDGE			DOCKET NUMBER	
DATE	SIGNATI	URE OF ATTORNEY	OF RECORD		
10/25/2012		id Krieger, Es			
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY			T '		
RECEIPT #	AMOUNT APPLY	YING IFP	JUDGE_	MAG. J	UDGE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT for the

District of Nevada

Nancy Sagona)))
Plaintiff(s) v. Enhanced Recovery Company, LLC)) Civil Action No.))
Defendant(s)))
SUMMONS II	N A CIVIL ACTION
To: (Defendant's name and address)	
Enhanced Recovery Con Nevada Registered Ager 202 South Minnesota Str Carson City, NV 89703	nt: Capitol Corporate Services, Inc.
A lawsuit has been filed against you.	
are the United States or a United States agency, or an off P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an a	you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you ficer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of tion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney,
HAINES & KRIEGER, LI 5041 N. Rainbow Blvd. Las Vegas, Nevada 891	
If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be You also must file your answer or motion with the court	be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint.
	CLERK OF COURT
Date:	Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

AO 440 (Rev. 06/12) Summons in a Civil Action (Page 2)

Civil Action No.

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (1))

•	the summons on the individual at	(place)	
		on (date)	; or
☐ I left the summons a	at the individual's residence or us	ual place of abode with (name)	
		of suitable age and discretion who res	
on (date)	, and mailed a copy to th	e individual's last known address; or	
☐ I served the summo	ns on (name of individual)		, who
designated by law to a	accept service of process on behal	f of (name of organization)	. <u> </u>
		on (date)	; or
☐ I returned the sumn	nons unexecuted because		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
☐ Other (specify):			
My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$	0.00
I declare under nenalty	y of perjury that this information i	s true.	
r declare under penane,	or perjury muchine intermunent		
		Server's signature	
		Server 3 signature	
		Printed name and title	

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc: